

REMARKS

With entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 2-6 and 8-11 remain in the application, of which claims 2 and 8 are independent.

Allowable Claims

At paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 3 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

With entry of the foregoing amendment, claim 2 is now rewritten in independent form, and claims 3-6 now depend from claim 2. These claims should be in condition for allowance.

At paragraph 10 of the Office Action, claim 8 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 8 has also been rewritten in independent form and is thus now allowable. Claims 9-11 now depend from claim 8 and are allowable.

Regarding 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections

Previous claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung (U.S. Patent 6,466,964) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,658,258) (hereinafter "Chen".) Further, previous claims 6 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Chen and in further view of Perkins (1P Mobility Support RFC 2002, October 1996.)

All pending claims have now been amended to now depend from allowable claims 2 or 8. Since these claims add additional features to the independent claims, they too are in condition for allowance.

Applicants reserve the right to present the cancelled claims again in a continuation application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

David J. Thibodeau, Jr.

Registration No. 31,671

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 4/24/06